



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

4:10 use the word "propitiation," the ordinary means of which was, in the Mosaic ritual, a bloody sacrifice, and here without doubt is thought of as brought about by the violent death of Christ. In the Revelation are (1) Rev. 1:5 in harmony with the above, (2) Rev. 5:6, 9, the Son bears the marks of his cruel death on earth amidst the splendors of heaven, and this death is stated as the means of men's restoration into right relations with God, (3) Rev. 7:14, the cleansing by blood is appropriated by each one.

Both in the three Synoptics, in the Fourth Gospel and in the Epistles of John and the Revelation we have found the death of Christ referred to as the designed means of the salvation he announced to men, by which they are purified from sin.

A careful, compact, exegetical discussion, valuable for its collection of passages and for its scientific method. Subsequent papers will discuss the teaching of the other New Testament writers on this doctrine.

---

**St. Paul and the Objective.\*** It seems to be the opinion of many who write concerning the Apostle Paul that his was so peculiarly and absolutely a subjective nature that he took little or no notice of the objective. So especially Archdeacon Farrar (see first pages in his *Life of Paul*). To myself, in reading the letters of St. Paul, his sensibility and susceptibility to outward impressions, his abounding allusions to aspects of day and night, his vivid observations of the processes of culture and growth in cornfield and vineyard, fertile plain and mountain side, his notation of the ebb and flow of the seasons, his open ear to the winds and glittering rain, his ascents to the very top of the visible creation of God, his intense and frequently sad scrutiny of the mystery of this "unintelligible world" as seen in nature and human nature, his lofty measurement of man from face to soul, his ecstatic flights beyond these bounding skies, so run through all of them—like the veining of marble, not mere surface—that my difficulty is not collective but selective proofs. Consider his allusions to light, 1 Cor. 15:40, 41; 2 Cor. 4:6; Acts 26:13; Rom. 13:12, 13; Eph. 5:11; Phil. 2:15. His conception of God as supreme ruler over all the physical world, Acts 14:14-17; 17:23-25. That the problem of the visible universe, as testifying to the being and attributes of God, was unceasingly before the Apostle's mind, is seen in Rom. 1:20, compare 8:22. Was not he an observer of nature who wrote: "There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world, and no kind is without signification" (1 Cor. 14:10). Consider also his many metaphors drawn from the physical body, e. g. Rom. 12:4, 5; 1 Cor. 12:14-27; and those from buildings, 2 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 3:19; 1 Cor. 3:9; Eph. 2:20. Still larger and richer is the group of Pauline metaphors from husbandry, e. g. 1 Cor. 3:6, 9; 2 Cor. 10:13; and particularly the extended figurative use of the olive-tree, a wonderfully developed simile, in Rom. 11:13-24. The Grecian games, racing, wrestling, and the like, seem to have been a constant source of figures to him, e. g. 1 Cor. 9:24; Gal. 2:2; 5:7; Phil. 2:16; 3:14. Many also were drawn from war, as 2 Cor. 2:14; Eph. 6:11. Allusions abound in his writings which show that he was sensitive to the sights, sounds and conditions about him—examine 1 Cor. 9:7, 10, 11; 10:27; Eph. 6:6; Rom. 3:13; Gal. 6:8. I am convinced by these and similar passages in his Epistles, which reveal the fact by a thousand inci-

\*By Rev. A. B. Grosart, D. D., LL. D., in *The Expository Times*, Mar. 1892.

dental touches, that Paul's nature was one to which God's handiwork and man's handiwork in the world made strenuous appeal.

The terms subjectivity and objectivity, as employed in an attempt to define Paul's mental characteristics, must of course be used relatively. The exact point at which the second begins to characterize him, and the first fails longer to do so, it would not be easy to determine. Just how many metaphors drawn from the surrounding world ought Paul to have used to have saved himself from the charge of subjectivity? Certainly we have no right to expect them to abound in his writings as they did in Jesus' teaching, as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels. Besides, his epistles were a different sort of literary composition. The passages cited above are worthy of study, and a complete list of such Pauline metaphors would be very interesting and useful. Whether we ought to condemn Paul as subjective or praise him as objective (that seems to be the dilemma!) may be left for decision to the farther discussion of the subject which Dr. Grosart's paper is evidently intended to introduce.

---

**Is the Higher Criticism Scientific? \*** The higher criticism is literary criticism as distinguished from the lower—textual criticism. It is not biblical philology, nor exegesis, nor biblical history, nor dogmatics, nor apologetics, although it has relations with all these. It is the science of the structure and history of the biblical writings as works of human authorship. Its method is that of every true science, the method introduced into modern learning by Bacon; it does not begin with a thesis which it tries to establish by the facts, but with a candid study of the facts, to learn exactly what they are, and as far as may be, what they mean—to collect and classify these facts, and generalize from them to those literary and historical conclusions about the writings which the facts justify. It shares the limitations of all human science, it is fallible because men are so, its attainment of these ends is imperfect. But if the questions which the higher criticism seeks to answer cannot be answered by its methods, then there is no answer for them at all. Whatever may be said to the contrary, neither Christ nor his apostles have decided questions of Old Testament composition, authorship and date, and as for the New Testament no one pretends that they have done so. The exact sphere of the higher criticism, however, is to be carefully noted. Inasmuch as it deals only with the literary form of the Bible, it has no right to form an "estimate of it as a professed Divine revelation." Higher critics may form such estimates, but in doing so they have left the field of higher criticism for that of dogmatics, and the science of higher criticism must not be held responsible for their dogmatizing. In the same way it is not the business of higher criticism to establish or controvert any theory of inspiration whatever.

There is a prevailing ignorance as to the methods and scope of the higher criticism which is unfortunate and lamentable. People do not yet realize that it is a genuine science, deserving of the same attention and respect as other sciences, with the same right to determine definitely and finally all matters which come within its province, and with a province essentially and distinctly limited. Let us conscientiously inform ourselves concerning the things with which we have to do; if we feel called upon to engage in current biblical controversies, let us at least know just what we are attacking or defending. Dr. Brown has rendered an important service by his clear statement of what the higher criticism is and what it is not, of the field in which it is supreme, and the fields in which it has no responsibility.

\* By Prof. Francis Brown, D. D., in *Homiletic Review*, Apr. 1892.